

AGENDA
Alaska TRCC Meeting

February 11, 2009

AST Conference Room, 5700 Tudor Rd.

1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Tele conf # 1-800-315-6338, meet me code 5682

Attendees:

- Ulf Petersen, CVE
- Hans Brinke, AST
- Kat Peterson, AST
- Diane Schenker, Courts
- Cindy Cashen, AHSO
- Kim Carpenter, MOA
- Carl Gonder, DOT
- Rick Richter, DMV
- Ron Martindale, DOT
- Tony Piper, ASAP
- Jonathan Miller, InsureNet
- Renee Oistad, APD
- Maxine Andrews, AACOP
- Marcia Howell, AIPC
- Kerry Hennings, DMV
- Joanna Bradford, AHSO

On phone:

- Shirley Wise
- Greg Frederickson
- Dave Brower
- John Lucking

The meeting commences at 1:30pm

I. Internal Committee Business

a. Approval of meeting notes from Dec. 18 meeting (Hans)

***Cindy moves to accept the minutes from last meeting

***Diane seconds

***All agree, no one opposed, no one abstains

b. Replacement / New members

- Tony Piper has sent paperwork up the chain, but has not received it back yet.
- Tim Bundy is supposed to replace Shelly Owens. We will need to follow up with Tim to see what they want to do.

- Cindy will follow up with Tim Bundy.

c. Other?

II. Updates on Action Items from Previous Meetings (Hans)

a. Tony Piper paperwork

- Still waiting (See I., b. above)

b. Legislative basis for TR Coordinator job position (Diane)

- Turned in at previous meeting.

c. List of cities that don't file all their traffic tickets with the court (Diane)

- Turned in at previous meeting

d. Kat and Diane will work on the Central State Repository of Traffic Offenses presentation for the CSG

- They have worked on it. Is there anything specific that people are looking for that you can't get today? Some examples to use this analysis for? Right now, you can only get bits and pieces of APSIN.
- Ulf – we will want to write queries
- Kat – talked about this, but is there anything different like roadways
- Ron – location information
- Carl – is there location info on the system?
- Kat – yes, in APSIN we capture a location and a location code, but not everyone enters their citations into APSIN. In the new TraCS form we have a place for lat/long.
- Carl – does the citation have enough info for geo referencing?
- Kat – TraCS is not currently hooked into the geo referencing tool
- Carl - if the laptop has it built in, then it could work
- Kat – the problem is that the place where the crash started and the location given on the form may not be the same. If you click on the locator tool it doesn't give you Mile Post, just lat/long
- Ron – we want age, gender, vehicle type. We do a lot of "what if" analysis
- Kat – this is a good example that could be helpful, and not captured. There's a bail amount and a point amount, but we capture on the disposition end, but not the original offense.
- Diane – the court captures this.
- Ron – We need to know how it went in originally. What the officer originally charge them with.
- Kat – right now there's no place to go for this. Only convictions. Nothing on the front end.
- Carl – if we want to associate any of this data with other data, you need a key to link to data in other systems. Same is true with the GIS

- Diane – hopefully we won't have to rely too much on names, the system identifier should be the unique identifier in all systems. There is always a tracking number.
 - Ron – are there ever any duplicates?
 - Kat – yes, the citation is totally different than the court form.
 - Ron – so you would need something like that unique identifier.
 - Kat – we have APSIN, ALVIN, court, and all the different city departments, but if you do a query right now, you have no way of knowing where they overlap. You have to ask them all individually
 - Carl – and even then you have no way to know if you are double counting something
 - Diane - if there is one system then you only have to do it once
 - Diane – this group moved to present this to the CSG meeting. Suggest APD and AACOP. The local law enforcement agencies need to be involved. John Rockwell was very concerned and called Diane about this. They currently manually type in all the incidents into APSIN. There is a lot of duplicated data entry. The only exception is in today, those agencies would have a workload increase.
 - Kat – those that have electronic will have to come up with an interface.
 - Hans – hopefully by the next ATRCC meeting we will have an idea from the CSG as to where they want to go.
- e. Ulf will work on scheduling the next CSG meeting
- Will be on Feb 25, 10am to 12 noon in AST conference room
- f. Cindy will send out a copy of the TOPS grant for members to read
- Completed.
 - Hans - Chief Lucking will do a presentation on this next month in person.
 - Cindy – if anyone needs a hard copy, contact her.
- g. Cindy will send out a copy of the Alcohol Assessment when it is final
- Completed.
 - Cindy - Have not sent out the electronic version, but will do this. It will also be available on the web page. On the stats and pub page.
 - Carl – is the Traffic Records assessment available on the AHSO web site?
 - Cindy - I think so, we will check and put it there if it is not.
 - Cindy - Back to the Alcohol Assessment, Page 25, 36, and 107 are traffic records related
 - Cindy - We need to increase our membership to include Native membership, military, non profits,
 - Cindy - Several of the items we have already included and are already implementing, but there are others that were generic and we'll need to find out what they mean. Basically we need to get outside the silos and share the data.

- Ulf – astonished at how much work there is to do. There is enough for a full time employee just doing this. It is a huge amount of work. But it is a great resource to find out what each section does.
- Cindy – these recommendations can be put into the strategic highway safety plan. And whatever the ATRCC doesn't take on, we can put into the strategic highway safety plan
- Hans - does anyone know if the CSG will do a strategic plan?
- Ulf – There are no plans to. They just take what we give them, make recommendations, and send them back down to us
- Hans - we can put the recommendations on the next meeting.
- Cindy – it seems that the traffic record projects that have already been approved should not have to be submitted to the ATRCC if they are an ongoing project. It creates a hardship to do this according to the calendar. If the ATRCC has already prioritized the concept, and however you get the money, it should just be with the AHSO deadlines, and not the ATRCC deadlines. This will lighten the load and eliminate the redundancy with the ATRCC.
- Ulf – last year we only looked at new projects. I agree. There is no point in going back and viewing ongoing older project. Just new projects
- Carl – if there are any new projects then we need the proposals put together and put in front of the ATRCC so we can get them going
- Cindy - this is the final draft of the alcohol assessment

III. Other Short Business? (Hans)

a. 12-200 Training (Ron M.)

- Ron – we have this grant, and there are issues about how and whether to go about this grant. We went in November to the CSG. How does AST want to proceed since it is their form? Col. Holloway said we'll get back to you. We are now into February, and we have no read on whether to do it or not. What we are looking for is some direction. We either turn all the money back, or yes we do it and address it in a committee that can be formed. We are waiting for the CSG to tell us.
- Kat – what are the potential changes in the MMUCC? Ron, Kat, and Carl were going to get together and discuss these changes. The best answer I have is updating at least the book, but without knowing the differences in the MMUCC, are we going to change the form? Can't answer what the differences are.
- Ron– the main differences are how we have organized our form and is it MMUCC compliant. The data is there, but we've done it differently. It's all there, but not in the places that MMUCC would want it. The majority of the changes are new choices in existing places. Does it matter that we have all the fields, or the order of the fields?
- Greg F. – as long as it is collected in the database, we are MMUCC compliant

- Ron – the government says: here's a new version you can look at, next year make the changes if you want money, then next year you *have* to do this
- Ron – now we are at MMUCC 3, when and if are we going to be required to change?
- Greg - we are not required to do the changes until the end of SAFETEA-LU, so right now just MMUCC 2 until then.
- Shirley – the next reauthorization is scheduled to end in FY09, but it will probably go into FY10. They are now working on the economic stimulus plan and not this reauthorization
- Greg – with a continuing resolution, we will work under the MMUCC 2.
- Ron – but we are working on MMUCC 1 right now
- Greg – 408 requires MMUCC
- Carl – but it doesn't say *which* MMUCC
- Kat – we should try to work on MMUCC 3, so we are compliant when it is ready
- Carl – but then we should hire a contractor
- Ulf – data quality is important. The bottom line for every month you delay the training, you are increasing the likelihood that the SOA data is suspect. There would be officers out there who are not filling the forms correctly
- Carl – I can guarantee this. A lot of fields are not filled out or are not correct
- Kat – ok but we'll need a DVD
- Ron – all we want to do is decide if we do training materials, and we need direction. We can launch into printed material
- Kat – we can't just put off MMUCC 3 until the government says. We need to do it now.
- Ron – do it all at the same time. At the same time we are preparing the training materials, we are at least identifying what we'll need to do later
- Carl – the scope of work doesn't include this. And if all we are doing is revising the blue handbook, how do we insure the officers are getting trained in this. This is part of taking a comprehensive approach, getting this into the brains of the officers, not just putting it into the manuals. The officer may not look into the manuals when filling out the form. We have to get the info into real training. The scope of work does not include the actual training, just the training materials. If you take and modify the manual, the transfer of knowledge will not get into the brains of the officers who are writing the crash forms. The manual by itself is not going to be helpful if they are not trained.
- Ron – but we don't own the form. If we are going to proceed, we need to form the committee to address this.
- Carl – believes just doing only the manual is a waste of time
- Ulf – recommends that Ron forms a committee and inform us at the next meeting.

- John Lucking – include all municipal departments too, not just the AST
- Ron – yes include all the local police departments as well
- Kat – DPS by law owns the form
- Cindy – not all cops know how to fill out the forms
- Hans – at some point we need to have this taken care of. Getting the training materials started, then work on getting a DVD made, but at least start somewhere
- Carl – this sounds like an action item that could come up in two weeks?
- Ulf – yes at the CSG meeting
- Carl – we will get the direction from the CSG meeting
- Ulf – but why wait two and half weeks to get started? For every month you delay you have officers out there filling it out incorrectly. Time is of the essence.
- Hans- we have a grant out there already
- Ulf, Cindy – then the money goes back
- Dave Brower – manual? Is this state or federal?
- Kat – Alaska by DOT, DPS, etc.
- Dave – who has a copy of the manual?
- Ron – I might have it in electronic form
- Dave – just a fill in the box?
- Ron – but the problem we are having is if it is MMUCC compliant in the training and in the examples
- Carl – it is not only not MMUCC compliant, it also doesn't use the D-16.
- Hans – we have a recommendation that we get a jump start on this. Do we form a subcommittee? Any volunteers?
- Ulf – will be on the subcommittee
- Chief Lucking will be on the subcommittee
- Kat will be on the subcommittee
- Dave Brower will be on the subcommittee
- Ulf – explains the CSG to the committee. We can get recommendations from them, for example hiring new positions, or funding for this. Occasionally we have issues to report to a higher authority. A higher body to shoot issues up to at the director level. At the end of last year we were able to have this formed. A total of 10 agencies that get together on an as-needed basis to help make these decisions.
- Ron – all I wanted to know is if we are going to move forward.
- Hans - the subcommittee will get together, wait from the CSG, and then talk again.

- b. Game plan for entire year. What do we want to accomplish this year? (Hans)**
- This agenda item was pushed to the next meeting

c. Chief Browning (Chair of TraCS Steering Committee) requests change of ATRCC dates to coincide with TraCS availability.

- Hans - To reduce the cost of people flying, we should have both meetings on the same day rather than two separate days. Would the ATRCC be willing to change?
- Cindy - what days are the conference room available all day?
- Hans - March 10th, April 7th, May looks like Tuesdays?
- Cindy – shall we change to the Tuesdays before the current Wednesdays?
- Kat – we only asked about Wednesdays and Thursdays with the doodle calendar, we never asked for Tuesdays before
- Hans – so we'll go ahead and move them to the Tuesdays before the current Wednesdays.
- Ulf – try to tentatively schedule march 10th
- Carl – contact Chief Browning and have him send out an email to the TraCS committee.
- Cindy – we could call him right now
- John Lucking – is not available for Tuesday ATRCC meetings
- (Hans calls Chief Browning on the phone)
- Hans – Chief Browning (on phone) is good for mornings on Tuesdays for TraCS
- John – go ahead and do it if the majority wants to
- Ulf – keep March with the current date, but then starting April all Tuesdays for both meetings.
- Chief Browning (on speaker phone) – We could move to different Wednesdays instead, so we could do the third Wednesdays of every month, instead of the second Wednesday like they are currently scheduled.
- Chief Lucking - can do the third Wednesday of every month.
- Hans - so starting March both meetings will be on the third Wednesday of every month.

d. Possible funding of Traffic Records Coordinator using 408 funds (Cindy, Ulf)

- Ulf – this is one of the issues that went up to the CSG last year. To have one dedicated body that would coordinate this position. Ulf was instructed by his agency to include the position as a line item in his agency to fund this position. He put a proposal together, but the position will need to address only CMVE issues.
- The concept was to ask for money for the first year of the Traffic records coordinator to do only Commercial Vehicles, then go to the ATRCC to ask other agencies to fund this position and work on another aspect for the next year. So they put an overall proposal together, and if adjustments are

required in the future we will adjust. But there is a chance that the Federal motor carrier may give them this money.

- If we did get money from the Federal Motor Carrier, would this ATRCC be willing to earmark some of this year's 408 money for this position?
- e. Update on 12-200 paper crash form lat-long utility in HAS (Carl)
- Carl – the AK Injury Prevention Center funded the project and Carl did the technical work.
 - The software has been written and accepted.
 - The system and programmers manual have been accepted
 - The user manual didn't contain any examples as to how to interpret lat/long. We asked them to put in examples, but they didn't. So I made up some examples and sent it off. Only this user manual is still being worked out.
- f. Where should Official ATRCC paperwork be stored? (Hans)
- Hans – for longevity.
 - Cindy – send it to Joanna in the AHSO
- g. E911 (Darrell Davis)
- Table this to the next meeting
- h. 2005, 2006, 2007 data availability for public review on Highway Data Office web site (Carl)
- There is no change from last time
 - Cindy – when will it be? Jack said that it would be available at the end of January
 - Carl – nothing has changed from last time
 - Cindy – will talk to Jack when we get back
- i. 2007 data availability in dataport (Ron)
- Ron – this is a two part question.
 - Carl – the problem is that the data is not in the database yet. We don't know how with the hiring freeze. We don't have anyone
 - Ron – asked Jack, he said that the only thing stopping the dataport going public is making it compliant with all the state web requirements.
- (**NOTE: This is for the actual dataport being made public, not the analyzed data on the web page, or the current non-public dataport available on the DOT intranet)
- Rick can provide help if Jack needs it. He chaired the group that made the state web site standards.

- Shirley – is this for locations? Separate from FARS data?
- Ron – this is all the state data on the dataport. This is not FARS data. This is for all the data on all the crashes for people to do their own extracts of state crash data.

j. TRIPRS (Cindy)

- Cindy – those of you who have traffic record projects and you are a project records manager need to go online and write a project update.
- Ron – is this regularly?
- Cindy – quarterly. And Cindy will remind everyone each time
- Kerry – needs some help
- Cindy – there are glitches. There wasn't an update button. But now it should be good to go.
- Carl – there are navigating issues.

k. Memorandum of Agreement for crash data sharing (Hans)

- Hans – Let's put this off until next meeting. There are a couple of different MOAs that have come up between these different agencies. The last one was signed a long time ago. And the one in 2000 hasn't been signed that we know of.
- Cindy – it is good to have when we have lawyers. We need to have this MOA that has been approved by the Department of Law. We don't want to release anything that is not our own.
- Dave – would be interested in this. Not sure that a state department can "own" something.
- Dave - Once a case is closed, it loses some amount of confidentiality.
- Cindy – can you take this on (Dave)?
- Dave – No. when a department gets a record request, it can be expensive, but the agency can't just deny a public record request, there has to be a reason, or an exception.
- Kat – but it has to come from the agency that made the report. So AST will only release what is available to be released.
- Diane – this agreement isn't about public records requests. It is just between agencies. An inter-agency MOA.
- Cindy – shouldn't AST do this?
- Kat – these are protected.
- Cindy – we can't just keep referring to state law.

- Hans – this all started with someone asking FARS for info, and if this info could be released. Hans will take this one on. Give him your comments. Do we need to expand this to other agencies?
- Cindy – wouldn't it make sense between the 10 CSG agencies?
- Diane – you need to have a specific data exchange agreement
- Carl – the old one that was signed just covered three agencies. A three party agreement that includes crash data. So when someone wants data, they will have to go to the source of the data. But now that we are sharing data with other agencies, are there others that need to be brought in? I don't think we should have anyone additional on here unless we are exchanging data with them.

I. Other?

IV. **CSG Action Items** (Ulf)

a. Central State Repository of Traffic Offenses: Summary of issue and recommendation for possible funding sources.

- Earlier discussion

b. Update from Ulf

- Earlier discussion

V. **Review of Alcohol Assessment's Recommendations** (Cindy)

- Earlier discussion, review at next meeting

VI. **Insurance Verification presentation** (Rick, Kerry)

- Jonathan Miller gives a presentation on InsureNet's National Insurance Verification System. Highlights are:
 - The cost of implementation is very low.
 - AK is one of three states that won't cost a lot of money.
 - This is a non-invasive system. No single person can be sought out.
 - No funding involved.
 - This is a National Insurance Database.
 - This system could lead to paperless insurance, drivers won't have to carry an insurance card, and also to lower insurance costs
 - It will weed out the cheaters.

- The officer running this will find that the process will never take more than 2 seconds
- No false positives.
- For more info: www.theinsurennet.com and the team room will be: alaskainsure.net, though it is not up yet.
- The point of contact for this project is Rick Richter in the DMV

VII. Action Items as a Result of This Meeting

- a. Tony Piper's paperwork
- b. Discuss the alcohol assessments requirements at next meeting
- c. Cindy will follow up with Tim Bundy about replacing Shelley Owens
- d. Cindy will send out an electronic version of the Alcohol Assessment, and it will be placed on the AHSO web page
- e. Cindy will check to see if the Traffic Records Assessment is on the AHSO web site, and have it put there if it is not
- f. Ron, Ulf, Kat, Dave Brower, and Chief Lucking will form a subcommittee to look at MMUCC compliance and the 12-200 training materials
- g. Cindy will talk to Jack Stickel about the availability of data on the Highway Data Office's web site
- h. Contact Darrell Davis regarding E911
- i. Hans will update the status of the Interagency MOA on crash data sharing

VIII. Last minute items?

a. Easy Street Draw Enterprise license for TraCS (Carl)

- Carl – one of the big advantages for using TraCS is a program called “Easy Street Draw”. It allows them to do a crash diagram right out of TraCS. The law enforcement officials were worried about how to afford the license. Carl was able to pay for this and has turned it over to the TraCS people to use. This is a freebee on Easy Street Draw, in that the initial licensing fee was paid by Carl (who now owns the license), and was then given to the TraCS subcommittee to use in TraCS. Carl will budget for maintenance for the first two years, but after that someone else will have to pay for maintenance. The Steering Committee will need to make a decision on how to distribute/install this to police departments.
- Ulf – this should go out to all the officers, that this bill has been paid
- Cindy – was this federal funding?
- Carl – yes, STIP project.

b. Other?

- Carl - just a reminder... a prioritization of people getting in grant requests.
- Ulf – but it should all be routine now.

IX. Next Meeting

- March 18, 2009

Meeting adjourns at 4:44pm